

REMARKS

A correction has been made to the specification to add an omitted reference number. Claims 1, 3 - 5, 9 - 10, 12 - 13, 15 - 17, 21 - 22, 24 - 25, 27 - 29, 33 - 34, and 36 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced with these corrections or amendments, which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claims 1 - 36 remain in the application.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action dated July 1, 2004 (hereinafter, "the Office Action") states that Claims 1, 13, and 25 (which are independent claims) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The language of the claim preambles has been clarified, and Applicants believe that this clarification resolves the concern noted in Paragraph 3. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the §112 rejection.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action states that Claims 1 - 8, 10 - 20, 22 - 32, and 34 - 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 5,862,323 to Blakley et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended their independent Claims 1, 13, and 25 herein to more clearly specify that it is an identifying secret "received ... during propagation request processing" (emphasis added) that is propagated from the password synchronization agent to one or more target registries, if validation of the user's information by a trusted master registry succeeds. By

Serial No. 09/613,983

-14-

Docket RSW9-2000-0044-US1

contrast, Blakley propagates a password that has been received, and stored, at some unspecified prior time. This was discussed in Applicants' prior response, dated May 5, 2004, which stated that it is "[t]his same information" (i.e., the newly-received identifying secret, not an already-stored identifying secret) that is propagated according to Applicants' independent claims. Blakley has no teaching of receiving a user password, or other type of user identifying secret, during his disclosed propagation request processing techniques, as will now be described.

In Blakley's "pull" technique, a foreign registry requests propagation of information. This pull technique is represented in Fig. 4. In contrast to their independent claims, Blakley has no teachings that this pull technique receives a user identifier and identifying secret from a client during propagation request processing. Applicants note that Blocks 410 - 422 of Fig. 4, which do involve client input, are a distinct processing path that is separate from the processing path of the pull technique which begins at Block 424. That is, the "password update" processing of Blocks 410 - 422 stores the updated password and then ends, without performing any propagation, at the "Return" block which is located above Block 450.

This "pull" technique therefore fails to teach the "receiving ..." limitation of Applicants' independent claims -- and as a result, Blakley also fails to teach Applicants' claim limitations of "validating the user ... using the received user identifier and identifying secret ..." (emphasis added) and "propagating the received identifying secret ..." (emphasis added).

In Blakley's "push" technique, represented in Fig. 5, a client requests either creation of a

new account (with a new password) or change of an existing password. This is not, however, "propagation request" processing: it is, as stated in Block 510, "account creation or password change" processing. Furthermore, Blakley's disclosed "push" technique does not include "validating the user with [a] trusted master registry ...", which is a limitation of Applicants' independent claims.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 13, and 25, as amended, are patentable over the reference. Dependent Claims 2 - 8, 10 - 12, 14 - 20, 22 - 24, 26 - 32, and 34 - 46 are therefore patentable over the reference as well. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §102 rejection.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action states that Claims 9, 21, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blakley in view of U. S. Patent 6,240,184 to Huynh et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Blakley fails to teach limitations of Applicants' independent claims. Thus, Huynh cannot be combined with Blakley to render dependent Claims 9, 21, and 33 unpatentable. Furthermore, Blakley fails to teach "performing a security function on the received identifying secret ..." (Claims 9, 21, and 33, first limitation, emphasis added) and also fails to teach "using the received user identifier to locate a previously-stored identifying secret ..." (Claims 9, 21, and 33, second limitation, emphasis added), where this secret was received

"during propagation request processing" (Claims 1, 13, and 25). Applicants therefore respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made out, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the §103 rejection.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,



Marcia L. Doubet
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 25260
Phone: 407-343-7586
Fax: 407-343-7587